



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/554,094	10/21/2005	Katsuyoshi Nagao	06854.0046	6586
22852	7590	08/12/2010	EXAMINER	
FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER LLP 901 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413				MARCETICH, ADAM M
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3761				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
08/12/2010		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/554,094	NAGAO ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	ADAM MARCETICH	3761

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 21 July 2010 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because

- (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
- (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
- (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
- (d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.

6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____.

Claim(s) objected to: _____.

Claim(s) rejected: 1,3 and 11-13.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet.

12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____

13. Other: _____.

/Leslie Deak/Primary Examiner, AU 3761

/Adam Marcetich/
Examiner, Art Unit 3761

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

RESPONSE TO ARGUMENTS

Applicant's arguments filed 21 July 2010 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant notes that Meierhoefer and Itoh lack a polyolefin-polycycloolefin blend in the claimed ratios of the intermediate layer of the container. Examiner finds that Ding fails to remedy this deficiency, since Ding does not provide any teaching or suggestion that the barrier properties of a plastic ampoule having a three layered structure could be improved by using a layer of a polyolefin-polycycloolefin blend.

Applicant reasons that Ding instead fabricates rigid, semi-rigid or flexible medical devices regardless of required mechanical properties. Applicant notes that Ding discloses rigid parts (such as Y-sites, filter housings in FIG. 1), semi-rigid parts (such as drip chamber 20 in FIG. 1) and flexible parts (such as medical container 12 in FIG. 1) which may be fabricated from COCs as a polyolefin-polycycloolefin blend (Col. 6, lines 30-63).

Here, Applicant finds that Ding is nonanalogous art since these integral structures lack multiple layers. Applicant reasons that one of ordinary skill in the art looking to provide a suitable multi-layered structure for a plastic ampoule would not consider Ding to modify the container of Meierhoefer and Itoh.

Examiner finds motivation to modify that Meierhoefer and Itoh in view of Ding, since Meierhoefer calls for a polymer adapted for solvent bonding. That is, COCs can be bonded or adhered by adding a solvent, joining the partially dissolved COC layer to other materials, and then allowing the solvent to evaporate. This avoids water-based adhesives, and keeps the overall water content low in the final article. Therefore Examiner maintains the rejection over Meierhoefer Itoh and Ding.